REMARKS

Claims 7, 12 and 13 are presented for consideration, with Claim 7 being independent.

An editorial change has been made to the specification. In addition, the abstract has been replaced to better set forth technical features of the claimed invention.

In the claims, Claim 7 has been amended to further distinguish Applicant's invention from the cited art, and Claims 12 and 13 have been added to provide an additional scope of protection. Claims 1-6 and 8-11 have been cancelled.

Claims 7-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as allegedly being indefinite. In amending Claim 7 as shown above, the grounds for this rejection were taken into consideration. Accordingly, it is submitted that Claims 7, 12 and 13 are in full compliance with the particularity and distinctness requirements of the statute, and therefore reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-4 and 6-11 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by Parce '358. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 7 of Applicant's invention relates to a detection method for detecting a plurality of different substances contained in a specimen using a label, comprising sequentially the steps of flowing the specimen through a detecting element having a first substance trapping portion immobilizing a first substance trapping body for specifically trapping a first substance

contained in the specimen, a second substance trapping portion immobilizing a second substance trapping body for specifically trapping a second substance contained in the specimen, with the second substance being different from the first substance, and a channel, and flowing a solution containing the label through the first substance trapping portion immobilizing the first substance trapping body and the second substance trapping portion immobilizing the second substance trapping body. Additional steps include flowing a solution for generating a signal from the label through the first substance trapping portion immobilizing the label such that a first layer of flow through the first substance trapping portion and a second layer of flow through the second substance trapping portion coexist and that the solution for generating a signal from the label forms the first layer of flow, to thereby acquire a signal from the first substance trapping portion, and flowing a solution for generating a signal from the label through the second substance trapping portion immobilizing the label such that a first layer of flow through the first substance trapping portion and a second layer of flow through the second substance trapping portion coexist and that the solution for generating a signal from the label forms a second layer of flow, to thereby acquire a signal from the second substance trapping portion.

Support for the amendments to Claim 7 can be found, for example, on page 9, line 11, *et. seq.*, of the specification. In accordance with Applicant's invention, a high performance detection method for detecting different substances contained in a specimen can be provided.

The Parce '358 patent relates to an assay system for monitoring transporter/transmitter activities in vitro. With reference to Figure 1, a transmitter 100 flows into a first channel, where it contacts cells or other components comprising transporter activity 104. A detectable signal is produced when the transmitter binds to the cells or other components which include receptors for the transmitter.

In contrast to Applicant's claimed invention, however, Parce fails to teach or suggest the detection method set forth in Claim 7 of sequentially flowing a specimen, a solution containing a label, a first signal generating solution and a second signal generating solution.

Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of the claims under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-6 were also rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by Parce '858, and Claims 1-5 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Kuhr '653. Without conceding to the propriety of these rejections, Claims 1-6 have been cancelled. These rejections are therefore deemed to be moot and should be withdrawn.

Accordingly, it is submitted that Applicant's invention as set forth in independent Claim 7 is patentable over the cited art. In addition, dependent Claims 12 and 13 set forth additional features of Applicant's invention. Independent consideration of the dependent claims is respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing, reconsideration and allowance of this application is deemed to be in order and such action is respectfully requested.

Applicant's undersigned attorney may be reached in our Washington, D.C. office by telephone at (202) 530-1010. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our below-listed address.

Respectfully submitted,

/Scott D. Malpede/

Scott D. Malpede
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 32,533

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-3801
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

SDM\rnm

FCHS_WS 1888310v1